REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 8-11, 13-15 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by European Patent Application Publication EP 0 752 786, by Thomson Consumer Electronics, where the inventors are Rohatgi et al. ("Rohatgi"). The Examiner also rejected claims 2, 4-5 and 12 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohatgi in view of a publication entitled "Applied Cryptography, Second Edition: Protocols, Alogorithms, and Source Code in C." by Schneider. The Examiner further rejected claims 7 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohatgi in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0194484, by Bolosky ("Bolosky").

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1-2, 4 and 8-20. However, Applicants have not added or canceled any claims. Accordingly, claims 1-20 will be pending after entry of this Amendment.

I.   Claims 1-7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Rohatgi. The Examiner also rejected claims 2, 4-5 under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohatgi in view of Schneider. The Examiner also rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Rohatgi in view of Bolosky. Claims 2-7 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 1. Claim 1 recites a method for sealing a computer program. The method divides the computer program into several pages, where the dividing is based on size of memory allocation in memory. The method calculates a hash value for each of the pages. The method creates a hash array with the hash values of the pages. The method creates a digital signature for the hash array. The method groups the computer program with the hash array and the digital signature.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose, teach, or suggest such a method. Rohatgi describes a method for transmitting authenticated application that includes audio/video data. The application is divided into modules. First, Rohatgi does not describe its application to be a computer program. Second, these modules are not pages. Specifically, these modules are not based on dividing a computer program into several pages, where the <u>dividing</u> is <u>based</u> on <u>size of memory allocation in memory</u>, as recited in claim 1. *See* e.g., specification, page 11, lines 15-20. In fact, Rohatgi does not describe any criteria for determining how the application is divided into modules, other than stating that some modules contain data and/or executable data.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 1 unpatentable. As claims 2-7 are dependent directly or indirectly on claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-7 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above for claim 1. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §§102 and 103 rejection of claims 1-7.

II.   Claims 8-17 Rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8-11, 13-15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Rohatgi. The Examiner also rejected claims 12 under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rohatgi in view of Schneider. The Examiner also rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Rohatgi in view of Bolosky. Claims 9-17 are dependent directly on claim 8. Claim 8 recites a method for authenticating a computer program. The method verifies the authenticity of a hash array that accompanied said computer program by using a digital signature of said hash array that accompanied said computer program, where prior to verifying the authenticity of the hash array, the computer program was divided into several pages based on size of memory allocation in memory. The method loads a page

from several pages of the computer program. The method calculates a hash value for said loaded page. The method compares the calculated hash value for the loaded page with an associated hash value for the loaded page from said hash array. The method generates an error if the calculated hash value for the loaded page does not match said associated hash value.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not disclose, teach, or suggest such a method. Rohatgi describes a method for transmitting authenticated application that includes audio/video data. The application is divided into modules. First, Rohatgi does not describe its application to be a computer program. Second, these modules are not pages. Specifically, these modules are not based on dividing a computer program into several pages, where the dividing of the computer program into several pages is based on size of memory allocation in memory. *See* e.g., specification, page 11, lines 15-20. In fact, Rohatgi does not describe any criteria for determining how the application is divided into modules, other than stating that some modules contain data and/or executable data.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references do not render claim 8 unpatentable. As claims 9-17 are dependent directly on claim 8, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9-17 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons that were discussed above for claim 8. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §§102 and 103 rejection of claims 8-17.

III.   Claims 18-20 Rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Rohatgi. Claims 19-20 are dependent directly on claim 18. Claim 18 recites a computer-readable medium comprising a set of computer instructions. The computer instructions are for authenticating a computer program. The computer instructions verify the authenticity of a hash array that accompanied the computer program by using a digital signature

-- 9 --

of the hash array that accompanied the computer program, where prior to the computer instructions verifying the authenticity of the harsh array, the computer program was divided into several pages based on size of memory allocation in memory. The computer instructions load a page from several pages of the computer program. The computer instructions calculate a hash value for the loaded page. The computer instructions compare the calculated hash value for the loaded page with an associated hash value for the loaded page from said hash array. The computer instructions generate an error if the calculated hash value for the loaded page does not match said associated hash value.

Applicants respectfully submit that Rohatgi does not disclose, teach, or suggest such a computer readable medium. Rohatgi describes a method for transmitting authenticated application that includes audio/video data. The application is divided into modules. First, Rohatgi does not describe its application to be a computer program. Second, these modules are not pages. Specifically, these modules are not based on dividing a computer program into several pages, where the <u>dividing</u> of the computer program into several pages is <u>based</u> on <u>size of memory allocation in memory</u>. *See* e.g., specification, page 11, lines 15-20. In fact, Rohatgi does not describe any criteria for determining how the application is divided into modules, other than stating that some modules contain data and/or executable data.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Rohatgi does not render claim 18 unpatentable. As claims 19-20 are dependent directly on claim 18, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 19-20 are patentable over Rohatgi for at least the reasons that were discussed above for claim 18. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102 of claims 18-20

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims, namely claims 1-20, are in

condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is requested.

Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER, JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP

Dated: 3/16/06

Ali Makoui
Reg. No. 45,536

Stattler Johansen & Adeli LLP
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, CA 90067-2337
Phone: (310) 785-0140
Fax: (310) 785-9558